

## REMARKS

The Specification has been amended. Claims 1 - 4, 13, 17, 19 - 21, 23, 25 - 28, 36, 38 - 50, and 53 - 55 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced with these amendments, all of which are supported in the specification as originally filed. Claims 56 - 57 have been cancelled from the application without prejudice. Claims 1 - 55 remain in the application.

### I. Information Disclosure Statement

Paragraph 2 of the Office Action dated February 24, 2005 (hereinafter, "the Office Action") states that the references cited in the text must be provided on a separate paper. Accordingly, PTO Form SB/08A is submitted herewith, listing the cited references (and copies of the non-US references are included herewith).

### II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Paragraph 4 of the Office Action states that Claims 1 - 14, 18 - 33, 37 - 48, and 50 - 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Ying, U. S. Patent 6,757,521. Claims 56 and 57 have been cancelled from the application, rendering the rejection moot as to those claims. This rejection is respectfully traversed with regard to the remaining claims.

Referring to Ying's **Fig. 27** and its corresponding text, an architecture used by his invention has the portable diagnostic device **730** communicating:

(1) over wireless communication links **715**, **717** with a wireless interface unit **720** of a control network **705** (e.g., where the wireless interface unit **720** provides access to a control

network **705** of a bus or other vehicle). See, for example, col. 9, lines 8 - 14.

and (2) through use of a wireless communication link **715** with a ground station **710** and its link **751**, with a local area network (“LAN”) **754** through a ground station interface **783** acting as a gateway for the LAN. See, for example, col. 9, lines 14 - 22 and col. 8, lines 48 - 49.

Or, the control network **705** (i.e., the network of the bus or other monitored entity) may communicate directly with the ground stations **710**, as shown by link **716**. See, for example, col. 9, lines 23 - 27.

This architecture is distinct from that used by Applicants’ invention. In Applicants’ invention, a mobile wireless device communicates (e.g., through an interfacing means) with a centralised control system, and the centralised control system monitors and controls the process sections. (See, for example, p. 12, lines 8 - 10 of Applicants’ specification.) That is, in contrast to the approach taught by Ying, Applicants’ mobile wireless device does not communicate directly with process sections (but instead, communicates with the centralised control system).

Applicants’ independent Claims 1, 25, 44, 50, and 55 have been amended herein to clarify the architecture used by Applicants’ invention. In each case, the claims explicitly specify that the centralised control system *controls* the process sections (or equivalently, that the process sections *are controlled by* the centralised control system).

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that their independent Claims 1, 25, 44, 50,

and 55 are patentable over the teachings of Ying. Dependent Claims 2 - 14, 18 - 24, 26 - 33, 37 - 43, 45 - 48, and 51 - 54 are therefore deemed patentable over Ying (at least) by virtue of the patentability of the independent claims from which they depend. The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to withdraw the §102 rejection.

### III. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Paragraph 6 of the Office Action states that Claims 15 - 17, 33 - 35 (believed by Applicants to be a typographical error that should refer instead to Claims 34 - 36), and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ying. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Applicants respectfully submits that their independent Claims 1, 25, and 44, from which Claims 15 - 17, 34 - 36, and 49 depend, are patentable over Ying. Dependent Claims 15 - 17, 34 - 36, and 49 are therefore deemed patentable over the reference by virtue of (at least) the patentability of the independent claims from which they depend. The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to withdraw the §103 rejection.

### IV. Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending rejected claims, withdrawal of all presently outstanding rejections, and allowance of all remaining claims at an early date.

Respectfully submitted,



Marcia L. Doubet  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 40,999

Customer Number for Correspondence: 25260

Phone: 407-343-7586

Fax: 407-343-7587